

**Remarks**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 7, 18-20, 17-28, and 30-31 as being anticipated under 35 USC § 102 by U. S Patent No. 5,775,005 to McClelland ("McClelland") and claims 5,6,21 and 22 under 35 USC § 103 as being obvious in view of McClelland over Design Choice. Due to the foregoing amendments and following remarks, these rejections should be withdrawn.


All claims require an opening that is unobstructed in a location at least partially defined by a bottom perimeter of the plug and a distance between the bottom perimeter and the outer surface of the outsole.

McClelland does not disclose an opening unobstructed in this location and further teaches away from having such an unobstructed opening. McClelland's windows 34, 36 are not only taught to be placed in the opening between the cushions 30, 32 (what the Examiner equated to be Applicant's plug) and the outer surface of the outsole, they are required to be placed in these locations to create a cushioning action by flexing upwardly against the cushions 30, 32. See col. 2, line 60 to col. 3, line 10. Hence, McClelland teaches away from Applicant's claimed opening that is unobstructed in a location at least partially defined by a bottom perimeter of the plug and a distance between the bottom perimeter and the outer surface of the outsole.

Because McClelland fails to disclose an opening unobstructed in a location at least partially defined by a bottom perimeter of the plug and a distance between the bottom perimeter and the outer surface of the outsole, all limitations of Applicant's claims are not anticipated and Applicant respectfully requests the rejections under 35 USC § 102 be withdrawn.

Page 9  
Serial No. 10/057,503  
Supplemental Response to Final Official Action

Respectfully submitted,



---

Gene S. Winter, Registration No. 28,352  
David Chen, Registration No. 46,613  
Attorneys for Applicant  
ST.ONGE STEWARD JOHNSTON & REENS LLC  
986 Bedford Street  
Stamford, CT 06905-5619  
203 324-6155